

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

PCT

NOTIFICATION CONCERNING
TRANSMITTAL OF COPY OF INTERNATIONAL
PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(CHAPTER I OF THE PATENT COOPERATION
TREATY)

(PCT Rule 44bis.1(c))

To:

GARDNER, J. Steven
Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101-2400
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Date of mailing (day/month/year)

09 February 2006 (09.02.2006)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

GP-137-00PCT

IMPORTANT NOTICE

International application No.

PCT/US2004/023827

International filing date (day/month/year)

23 July 2004 (23.07.2004)

Priority date (day/month/year)

30 July 2003 (30.07.2003)

Applicant

GOOGLE INC. et al

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

DOCKETED

FOR: JSG/MJT

DUE DATE: _____

ON: 2/16/06 BY: KF

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Authorized officer

Yolaine Cussac

Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 70 80

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference GP-137-00PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2004/023827	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 23 July 2004 (23.07.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 30 July 2003 (30.07.2003)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant GOOGLE INC.			

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).																
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I	Basis of the report																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II	Priority																
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).																

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Date of issuance of this report 30 January 2006 (30.01.2006)</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Authorized officer Yolaine Cussac</td> </tr> </table>	Date of issuance of this report 30 January 2006 (30.01.2006)	Authorized officer Yolaine Cussac
Date of issuance of this report 30 January 2006 (30.01.2006)	Authorized officer Yolaine Cussac		
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 80		

[TENT COOPERATION TRE/ Y

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 17 DEC 2004

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

10/9

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US2004/023827

International filing date (day/month/year)
23.07.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
30.07.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F17/30

Applicant
GOOGLE INC.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 65.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Boyadzhiev, Y

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4548



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2004/023827

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2004/023827

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
- ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
4. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-35
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-35
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-35
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

1. The following document is referred to in this communication:

D1 : US 6 473 730 B1 (KAN MIN-YEN ET AL) 29 October 2002 (2002-10-29)

Objections under Article 6 PCT

2. The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because independent claim 28 is not clear.

2.1 The expression "at least in part" used in claim 28 (line 4-5 and 6-7) is vague and makes the claim unclear because it is not clear on what else the matching performed is based. In order to overcome this objection this expression should be deleted.

Objections under Article 33(3) PCT

3. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1-35 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

3.1 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Document D1 discloses :

A method (column 2 lines 32-34, "...method ... documents."), comprising :

- accessing a source article (column 2 line 54 and 55, "extracting ... information.");
- identifying a plurality of regions in the source article (column 2 lines 32 and 33, "...to efficiently ... documents.");
- determining at least one local concept associated with each region (column 4 lines 2-6, "determining ... of the text.");
- analysing the local concepts of each region to identify any unrelated region (column 8 lines 59-61, "A raw ... the segment.");
- eliminating the local concepts associated with any unrelated regions to determine relevant concepts (column 10 lines 36-42, "Nominally ... input." and column 10 lines 45-47, "Each ... segment.");

The segment scores for each of the topical segments in D1 are computed to reflect the importance of a segment versus every other segment identified within the document.

The segment scores in combination with the classification based on the type of the segments is performed in order to select only important (relevant) segment and to ignore not important (irrelevant) segments. This implies that topical information (terms) from not important segments is not taken into account when generating the summary of the document.

- analysing the relevant concepts to determine a source meaning for the source article (column 10 lines 48 and 49, ""Summary" ... document input."); and

The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from this known from D1 in that :

- matching the source meaning with an item meaning associated with an item from a set of items.

For the skilled person the feature of matching the source meaning of an article with an item meaning is well known in the art of data retrieval, accordingly, the skilled person would modify the method of D1 to add the extra step of matching the source meaning (the summary) of the document with an item meaning from a set of items. The skilled person would thereby arrive at the method of claim 1 without the exercise of any inventive skill, therefore the subject-matter of claim 1 can not make an inventive contribution.

3.2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 28

The subject matter of claim 28 differs from the subject matter of claim 1 in that the matching is performed for the concept(s) determined from a content region and not for the source meaning of the whole document. This is also well known in the art of data retrieval, therefore the subject-matter of claim 28 can not make an inventive contribution.

3.3 DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The additional technical features of dependent claims 2-13, and 29-35 represent only implementation details and do not contain any features which in combination with the features of any claim to which the refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect to inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

3.4 The subject-matter of claims 14-27 corresponds in terms of a computer-readable medium comprising a computer program product features to that of claims 1-13. The objections raised in respect to claims 1-13, therefore, also apply, mutatis mutandis, to the corresponding claims 14-27.